

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated August 28, 2007, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by November 28, 2007.

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application, with claims 3-10 having been withdrawn pursuant to an election requirement.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,469,136 to Jenkinson.

In the present amendment, the specification has been amended to add standard headings and to delete reference to the claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the present invention over the Jenkinson reference. Specifically, claim 1 now defines that each winding slot 4 has two undercuts 16 and that the winding slots 4 of a first armature lamination 2 of two adjacent laminations 2, 3, 3' has a smaller cross section and a smaller constriction 15 than a second armature lamination 3 of the two adjacent laminations 2, 3, 3'. Support for these new features can be found in the original specification on page 5, lines 14-17 and lines 27-30 and on page 6, lines 2-5.

Jenkinson fails to disclose these features of amended claim 1. As shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of Jenkinson, the laminations 11 do not have undercuts, while laminations 12 have these undercuts (column 2, lines 8-11). This is the only

difference between the two types of laminations 11, 12 of Jenkinson. These laminations are equal in their cross section.

Therefore, the arrangement of the laminations as disclosed by Jenkinson does not offer the same advantages as the present invention. Specifically, because the cross section of each winding slot has a constriction on the outer end, in particular with two undercuts, good introduction of the winding wires located in the winding slots and protection of them against mechanical wear from outside are assured.

Because claim 1 as amended defines features that are not disclosed by Jenkinson, the rejection under Section 102 must be withdrawn. Jenkinson is not a proper reference under 35 USC 102 pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the last paragraph of MPEP section 2131, where it is stated that "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference", and that "the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim".

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, and 11 are patentable over the cited art. The Applicants further request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and allowance of the claims as herein amended.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss

appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700